arXiv:1408.6813v3 [gr-qc] 5 Mar 2015

What is faster — light or gravity?

S. Krasnikov

The Central Astronomical Observatory at Pulkovo

General relativity lacks the notion of the speed of gravity. This is inconvenient, and the current paper is aimed at filling this gap. To that end I introduce the concept of the "alternative" and argue that its variation called the "superluminal alternative" describes exactly what one understands by the "superluminal gravitational signal". Another, closely related, object called the "semi-superluminal alternative" corresponds to the situation in which a massive (and therefore gravitating) body reaches its destination sooner than a photon *would*, if the latter were sent *instead* of the body. I prove that in general relativity constrained by the condition that only globally hyperbolic spacetimes are allowed, 1) semi-superluminal alternatives are absent and 2) under some natural conditions and conventions admissible superluminal alternatives are absent too.

I. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this paper is to compare the speed of gravity with the speed of light within general relativity. In this section we discuss a major obstacle in achieving this goal, which is the lack of a suitable — that is physically motivated, but rigorous — definition of the "speed of gravity" in the general case (i. e., say, beyond the linearized theory). Without such a definition any answer to the question posed in the title of this paper is obviously meaningless, but the reason for its lack is quite valid: the Universe according to relativity is a "motionless", "unchanging" 4-dimensional object, and gravity is just its shape. But what can be called the speed of a shape? What is the "speed of being a ball"?

Still, there are situations in which it would be convenient to be able to assign a speed to gravity, or at least to be able to tell whether it is greater/less than the speed of light. Consider, for example, an observer orbiting a red giant. Suppose one day the events s, b, and a happen: s is the star exploding as a supernova, a is the observer seeing the explosion, and b is the observer's equipment showing that the local geometry has drastically changed as a result of the same explosion. The sought-for definitions must allow one to say that the

propagation of gravity was superluminal, if $b \prec a$ [written also $b \in I^-(a)$, or $a \in I^+(b)$], i. e. if there is a piecewise timelike future directed curve from a to b. To put it slightly more mathematically let us write $x \lessdot y$ for "x gravitationally affects y" or, interchangeably, "x is a (gravitational) cause of y". Then our task is to define the "gravitational cause" so that the gravitational signalling would be recognized superluminal if and only if there is a pair of points s, b such that $s \lessdot b$ even though $s \not\preccurlyeq b$, where $s \preccurlyeq b$, or $s \in J^-(b)$ means "there is a piecewise nonspacelike future directed curve from s to b". By saying so we, of course, have not solved the problem, but have made it clearer, or so it seems. All one needs now is to put forward an intuitively acceptable criterion for whether an event acts gravitationally upon another (in the example with the supernova this fact was hidden in the words "a *result* of the same explosion").

Probably the simplest step along these lines is to declare that $s \lessdot b$ when and only when the two events can be connected by a piecewise smooth curve — called *gravitational signal* — defined by a condition imposed on its velocity. For example, the tangent to the curve might be required to be null, or to obey some constraints involving velocities often mentioned in discussing superluminal signaling by material fields: phase velocity, group velocity, or the velocity of transport of energy. For the gravitational field, however, this approach does not work. In the general case it is even hard to define those quantities, but there is also a more serious reason for the failure. Let us turn for a moment to material fields.

1. Example. (I) Consider a Minkowski space with a field f in it which obeys only the equation

$$\Box \mathsf{f} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \delta(x - x_k - v_k t), \tag{1}$$

where the constants K, x_k, v_k — are free parameters of the theory. It is not that simple to justify any particular definition of the signal in this case (hereafter we shall touch on that). What *is* clear in advance, however, is that any *reasonable* definition of signals must be satisfied, in particular, by the future directed lightlike broken lines (otherwise one will have to reinterpret the entire Special relativity, with its thought experiments involving essentially the same field). Similarly, spacelike separated points must prove to be causally disconnected. So, for instance, the point b_N with the coordinates $t = 1$, $x = 1$, $y = N$, $z = 0$ is affected by the origin of the coordinates, when $N = 0$, but not when $N = 1$.

It is noteworthy that such a choice of the cause-effect relation makes the interpretation of

the lines $x = x_k + v_k t$ with $v_k < 1$ and with $v_k > 1$ strikingly different. While the former geodesics are just the world lines of ordinary pointlike charges (the zero acceleration may mean that their masses are very large), the latter ones do not correspond to any particles *at all*. Each point of such a line is causally disconnected from all others. So instead of propagation of a particle we have a *process* which takes place *independently* at every point of the line (cf. a light spot running along a remote surface [1]) and which consists in f infinitely growing prior to such a point and falling immediately after its occurrence.
(II) Consider now a theory in which the field f obeys the wave equation, but also is subject to an *additional* condition of the periodicity in the y direction:

$$\mathsf{f}(t, x, y + 1, z) = \mathsf{f}(t, x.y.z). \tag{2}$$

Now whatever information about the origin of coordinates o can be inferred from the values at b_0 of the field and its derivatives $\mathsf{f}_{,\mu\ldots}(b_0)$, exactly the same information will be available to an observer who measures $\mathsf{f}_{,\mu\ldots}(b_N)$, $N \neq 0$. So we have to conclude that in *this* theory $o \lessdot b_N \ \forall N$.

There are no reasons whatsoever to believe in periodic fields. The example is cited only to demonstrate that (i) Equations of motion alone cannot determine the causal structure of a theory. Correspondingly, none of the aforementioned velocities can serve as the signal speed and (ii) Two events (o and b_2, for instance) can be causally related ($o \lessdot b_2$), even though they are not connected by a signal understood as a curve $\sigma(\tau)$ such that

$$\sigma(0) = o, \qquad \sigma(1) = b_2, \qquad \sigma(\tau_1) \lessdot \sigma(\tau_2) \quad \text{at } \tau_1 < \tau_2.$$

In this sense the relation $\lessdot$ is not quite local.

From the foregoing it appears that one ought to abandon (at this stage, at least) the concept of the signal and to define the relation $\lessdot$ directly from its physical meaning, in the spirit of the preceding examples. In all appearance the notion of "cause" will be satisfactorily captured by a relation $\lessdot$, if the latter has the following properties:

P1. $\lessdot$ is a partial order relation. Indeed, it must be transitive (since the cause of a cause is obviously a cause), reflective (it is just a matter of convention and we choose the analogy with the relation $\preccurlyeq$), and antisymmetric (an event different from a cannot be both a cause and an effect of a).

P2. if $a \lessdot b$, then there exists a set S such that

(a) S determines $\mathsf{f}(b)$ in the sense that the values taken in S by the field and its derivatives $\mathsf{f}_{,\mu\ldots}(x)$, $x \in S$ fix uniquely the value $\mathsf{f}(b)$;

(b) if A is a neighbourhood of a, then $S - A$ does *not* determine $\mathsf{f}(b)$.

The requirement P2 is justified by the fact that it is an embodiment of the idea that

P2*. any change in the effect is produced only by a change in some of its causes.

The relation $\lessdot$ is not defined *uniquely* by those properties; for example, the relation $\gtrdot$ defined by the equivalence

$$a \gtrdot b \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad b \lessdot a$$

presumably also possesses them. To fix the non-uniqueness one may need an additional convention, which is not surprising: different definitions of the causal order within a given theory account for different views on what is freely specifiable in that theory.

One might wish the above formulated definition to be more strict, but by and large it seems adequate in discussing causal properties of matter fields. It could be expected that in the gravitational case the cause-effect relation can be introduced in the same manner, one only must take f to be the metric. Presumably, it is this conviction that suggests the following simple resolution of the problems considered in this paper: "The solution [to the Einstein equations] obtained depends, at a point x, only on the initial data within the hypercone of light rays [...] with vertex x, that is, on the relativistic past of that point. This result confirms the relativistic causality principle as well as the fact that gravitation propagates with the speed of light" [2]. The flaw in this resolution is that "is fixed as a solution of a differential equation by the data within a set S" and "is caused only by points of S" is not the same. In other words, the causality relation in the gravitational case may not obey P2. This is, in particular, because the principle P2* does not apply to the metric. The point is that while for a material field f it is quite clear what "a change in $\mathsf{f}(p)$" is, there is no such thing as a "change in the metric at p". Indeed, in considering a spacetime (M_1, g_1) one can give a precise meaning to the words "the geometry of a set $V_1 \subset M_1$ has changed": they mean that we consider *another* spacetime (M_2, g_2) and state that there is a set $V_2 \subset M_2$ and an isometry ϕ which maps $M_1 - V_1$ to $M_2 - V_2$, but which cannot be extended to an isometry mapping the entire M_1 to M_2. However, that change cannot be

resolved into pointwise changes: there is no way, in the general case, to put in correspondence a particular $p_2 \in V_2$ to each $p_1 \in V_1$ (note that V_2 even need not be diffeomorphic to V_1) so as to compare $\mathsf{g}_2(p_2)$ to $\mathsf{g}_1(p_1)$ and thus to find out whether the metric in p_1 has changed.

It is clear from the foregoing that there is no easy way of introducing the relation $\prec$. Therefore we take a completely different approach.

II. ALTERNATIVES

In this section we formulate conditions which being imposed on a pair of spacetimes M_1 and M_2 allow one to speak of that pair as describing two different extensions of a *common prehistory* (in the example which opens the paper this prehistory would include the life of the red giant prior to the explosion s). That will enable us to translate the question of whether relativity (in a broad sense) admits superluminality of any kind into the question of when the difference between such M_1 and M_2 is attributable to a certain event and its consequences [3].

2. Definition. A pair of pointed inextendible spacetimes (M_k, g_k, s_k), $k = 1, 2$ is called an *alternative*, if there exists a pair of open connected past sets $N_k \supset \Big(J^-(s_k) - s_k\Big)$ and an isometry ϕ which maps N_1 to N_2 and $J^-(s_1) - s_1$ to $J^-(s_2) - s_2$ (all matter fields in N_1 and N_2 are assumed to be tensors related by the same ϕ).

3. Notation. For a given alternative the pair N_1, ϕ need not be unique. Let $\{N_1^\alpha, \phi^\alpha\}$ be the family of all such pairs. By (N_1^*, ϕ^*) we shall denote its *maximal* element, that is one which is not "smaller" than any other:

$$\nexists \alpha_0 : \qquad N_1^* \subsetneq N_1^{\alpha_0}, \quad \phi^* = \phi^{\alpha_0}|_{N_1^*} .$$

Correspondingly, $N_2^* \equiv \phi^*(N_1^*)$.

The existence of (N_1^*, ϕ^*) follows from Zorn's lemma, since the open subsets of M_1 and M_2 are partially ordered by inclusion

$$A \leq B \;\Leftrightarrow\; A \subset B,$$

and with such an ordering every chain $\ldots \leq A_1 \leq A_2 \leq \ldots$ has an upper bound $\cup_i A_i \subset M_{1,2}$.

4. Comment. It is the regions $N_k^* \subset M_k,\ k = 1, 2$ that describe the mentioned prehistory. The requirement that they be isometric is self-obvious. It is also obvious why both of

them must be past sets (two spacetimes evidently do not describe the same region of the Universe, if their inhabitants differ in remembrances). As was explained in the Introduction, our main interest is actually *non*-isometric regions of M_k and we need N_k^* only as a tool for outlining those regions. That is why we require N_k^* to be connected and maximal. Finally, the points $s_k \in M_k$ describe the event (the star explosion in the mentioned example) responsible for splitting the evolution of the Universe into the two branches.

5. Definition. The sets $\mathcal{F}_k \equiv \mathrm{Bd}\, N_k^*,\ k = 1, 2$ will be termed *fronts*. A front $\mathcal{F}_k$ is *superluminal*, if $\mathcal{F}_k \not\subset \overline{J^+(s_k)}$.

Being the boundary of a past set a front is a closed, imbedded, achronal three-dimensional C^{1-} submanifold [4, Proposition 6.3.1]. At either k the front $\mathcal{F}_k$ bounds the region $M_k - \overline{N_k^*}$, in which, loosely speaking, the remembrances (concerning the gravitational or material fields) of every observer differ from what they would remember, if some other event happened in s. We interpret such a difference as evidence that the mentioned observer received a signal from s. Correspondingly, when such an observer is located out of $\overline{J^+(s_k)}$ the signal is superluminal, hence our definition.

The concept of an alternative is quite rough. In the general case it does not make it possible to assign a specific speed to a "gravitational signal", if by the latter a front is understood. Even the source of the signal cannot be determined uniquely: the same pair of spacetimes can satisfy the definition of alternative with different choices of points s_k. Nevertheless, it allows one to formulate a *necessary* condition for calling the speed of gravity superluminal. Namely, in considering a particular theory (i. e. a set of material fields and their relation to the geometry of the spacetime) let us single out a class of *admissible* alternatives, by which the alternatives are understood consisting of spacetimes $M_{1,2}$ such that they are equally possible in that theory and differ only by the events s_k and by the events which we agree to recognize as consequences of s_k (not as consequences of some primordial difference in the spacetimes). If none of the admissible alternatives has a superluminal front we shall acknowledge that the speed of gravity in this theory is bounded by the speed of light.

III. SUPERLUMINAL GRAVITATIONAL SIGNALS IN GR

Let us adopt the convention that an alternative (M_k, g_k, s_k) in which both spacetimes are globally hyperbolic is admissible, only if there are Cauchy surfaces $\mathcal{S}_k \subset M_k$ such that

$$s_k \in \mathcal{S}_k, \qquad \mathcal{S}_2 - s_2 = \phi^*(\mathcal{S}_1 - s_1)$$

and the values of material fields (and their derivatives, if necessary) in any $p \in \mathcal{S}_1$ are the same as in $\phi^*(p)$. Such a criterion does not look far-fetched, for, if there is no such a pair of Cauchy surfaces, why should one regard the difference in M_1 and M_2 as ensuing from what happened in s and its consequences, cf. [5]? It rather must be acknowledged as *primordial*.

The global hyperbolicity of $M_{1,2}$ implies the equality

$$M_k - J^+(s_k) = [J^-(s_k) - s_k] \cup \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S}_k - s_k),$$

where $\mathcal{D}(X)$ denotes the Cauchy domain of the set $X \subset M_k$ (i. e. the set of all points p of M_k such that every inextendible nonspacelike curve through p meets X). By the existence and uniqueness theorem equality of the initial data fixed at initial 3-surfaces implies isometry of the corresponding Cauchy domains. So, if an alternative is admissible, $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S}_k - s_k)$ are isometric and hence N_k^* [which by definition include $J^-(s_k) - s_k$] include also $M_k - J^+(s_k)$. Thus, neither of the fronts is superluminal. In this sense general relativity does prohibit superluminal propagation of the gravitational field: under the formulated above assumptions *the speed of a gravitational signal does not exceed the speed of light*.

6. Remark. The approach developed in this paper is suitable for other geometric theories as well. For example, to analyze the signalling in a theory dealing only with the causal relations between events, not with the entire metric, it suffices to replace the words *an isometry* ϕ in definition 2 by *a conformal isometry* ϕ. Likewise, one might be interested in a theory which considers only Ricci flat (i. e. empty, if the Einstein equations are imposed) spacetimes. The proposition proven in [6] and reformulated in terms of alternatives says that in such a theory superluminal alternatives turn out to be prohibited, if an alternative is admissible only when in one of its spacetimes the Weyl tensor vanishes to the future from a Cauchy surface through s.

It is important that the above-mentioned existence and uniqueness theorem is proven only under some "physically justified" assumptions regarding the properties of the right

hand side of the Einstein equation. A possible set of such assumptions is listed, for example, in [4] and one of them is that the stress-energy tensor is at most a polynomial in g^{ab} (the corresponding assumption in [7] allows the tensor to include also the first derivatives of the metric). But those assumptions are *known* to fail in some physically interesting situations. In particular, vacuum polarization typically leads to the appearance in the right hand side of the Einstein equations of terms containing second derivatives of the metric. Which suggests that strong seniclassical effects like those expected in the early Universe, or near black hole horizons, may lead to superluminal propagation of gravity.

IV. "SEMI-SUPERLUMINAL" ALTERNATIVES

The fact that a single event is associated with two fronts, either in its own spacetime, has a quite non-trivial consequence because they do not need to be superluminal both *at once*.

7. Definition. An alternative is called *superluminal* if both its fronts are superluminal and *semi-superluminal* if only one is.

Suppose, in a world M_1 a photon is sent from the Earth (we denote this event s_1) to arrive at a distant star at some moment τ_1 by the clock of that star. Let, further, M_2 be the world which was initially the same as M_1 (whether it *was* the same may depend on what theory we are using for our analysis of the situation), but in which instead of the photon a mighty spaceship is sent to the star (the start of the spaceship is s_2). On its way to the star the spaceship warps and tears the spacetime by exploding passing stars, merging binary black holes and triggering other imaginable powerful processes. Assuming that no superluminal ("tachyonic") matter is involved, the spaceship arrives at the star later than the photon emitted in s_2, but nevertheless it is imaginable that its arrival time τ_2 is *less* than τ_1. Thus, the speed of the spaceship in one world (M_2) would exceed the speed of light in another (M_1), which would not contradict the non-tachyonic nature of the spaceship. Nor would such a flight break the "light barrier" in M_1: the inequality $\tau_2 < \tau_1$ does imply that the front $\mathcal{F}_1$ is superluminal, but no *material signal* in M_1 corresponds to that front. In particular, there is no spaceship in *that* spacetime associated with $\mathcal{F}_1$. It is such a pair of worlds $M_{1,2}$ that we call a semi-superluminal alternative. A theory admitting such alternatives allows superluminal signalling without tachyons.

8. Example. Let M_1 be a Minkowski plane and s_1 be its point with the coordinates



FIG. 1: a) The world M_1. b) The world M_2. The shaded region is the causal future of s_2, and the dashed broken line is the front $\mathcal{F}_2$, which bounds N_2^*.

$t = -3/2$, $x = -1$. Let, further, M_2 be the spacetime obtained by removing the segments $t \in [-1, 1]$, $x = \pm 1$ from another Minkowski plane and gluing the left/right bank of either cut to the right/left bank of the other one. The differences between M_1 and M_2 are confined, in a sense, to the future of the points $t = -1$, $x = -1$ and $t = -1$, $x = 1$, see figure 1. Speaking more formally, N_1^* is the complement to the union of two future cones with the vertices at those two points. That N_1^* is maximal indeed is clear from the fact that any larger past set would contain a past directed timelike curve λ terminating at one of the mentioned vertices, while $\phi(\lambda)$ cannot have a past end point (because of the singularity). Evidently, $\mathcal{F}_1 \not\subset \overline{J^+_{M_1}(s_1)}$, so $\mathcal{F}_1$ is superluminal. At the same time the surface $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset M_1$ does not correspond to any signal in M_1 (see above). And the front $\mathcal{F}_2$ *is not* superluminal, whence we conclude that the alternative (M_k, g_k, s_k) is *semi*-superluminal. Although the spaceship reaches the destination sooner than the photon shown in figure 1, the photon belongs to another universe. In its own universe M_2 the spaceship moves on a timelike curve, in full agreement with its non-tachyonic nature.

A flaw in the just considered alternative is that the difference between M_1 and M_2 is too exotic. One cannot say today whether "the topology change" of that kind (if possible at all) can be attributable to something that takes place in $s_{1,2}$. Unfortunately, this is a general rule: as the following proposition shows, the spacetimes of a semi-superluminal alternative



FIG. 2: The hatched regions are $N_1^* \cap B_{r_j}$ and its image under ϕ, respectively. The ball B_{r_j} bounded by the dashed line lies, by hypothesis, outside $J^+(s_1)$. But this contradicts the fact that the curves $\phi^{-1}(\lambda_j)$ must converge to a future directed curve from s_1 to p.

cannot be "too nice".

9. Proposition. The spacetimes M_1 and M_2 of a semi-superluminal alternative (M_k, g_k, s_k) cannot both be globally hyperbolic.

10. Remark. Note the difference between this proposition and the statement proven earlier to the effect that within general relativity the spacetimes of a *superluminal* alternative cannot both be globally hyperbolic. The former, in contrast to the latter, states a purely kinematical fact depending neither on the Einstein equations, nor on criteria of admissibility of alternatives. Essentially, that fact is just a geometrical property of globally hyperbolic spacetimes.

Proof. Suppose that the front $\mathcal{F}_1$ is superluminal. Then some of its points must be separated from the — closed by the global hyperbolicity of M_1, see proposition 6.6.1 of [4] — set $J^+(s_1)$, that is there must be a point p, see figure 2, such that

$$p \in \mathcal{F}_1, \qquad B_r \cap \overline{J^+(s_1)} = \varnothing \quad \forall r < \bar{r},$$

where $\bar{r}$ is a constant, and B_r is a coordinate ball of radius r centered at p.

Pick a sequence $a_j \in I^-(s_1)$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$ converging to s_1. Our goal is to demonstrate that, unless $\mathcal{F}_2$ is superluminal, there is a timelike curve μ_j from a_j to B_{r_j} for any j and any

$r_j < \bar{r}$. That will prove the proposition, since r_j can be chosen so as to converge to zero. The future end points of μ_j in such a case will converge to p, which would imply, by lemma 14.22 of [8]. that $p \in J^+(s_1)$ in contradiction to the choice of p.

To find for a given j a curve μ_j of the just mentioned type, pick a pair of points

$$b_j \in \big(\mathcal{F}_1 \cap B_{r_j}\big) \quad \text{and} \quad c_j \in \mathcal{F}_2,$$

such that for any their neighbourhoods $U_j \supset b_j$ and $V_j \supset c_j$ it is true that

$$\phi\big(N_1^* \cap U_j\big) \cap V_j \neq \varnothing. \qquad (*)$$

To see that such pairs always exist, note that otherwise the maximal — by hypothesis — spacetime M_2, would have an extension $M_2^{\text{ext}} \equiv B_{r_j} \cup_{\phi'} M_2$, where ϕ' is the restriction of ϕ to a connected component of $N_1^* \cap B_{r_j}$ (obviously, M_2^{ext} is a smooth connected pseudo-Riemannian manifold containing M_2 as a proper subset. So, it is an extension of M_2, if it is Hausdorff, i. e. if there are no points b_j, c_j).

Now assume that $\mathcal{F}_2$ is *not* superluminal. Then c_j being a point of $\mathcal{F}_2$ must lie in $\overline{J^+(s_2)}$, and hence in the (closed) set $J^+(s_2)$ too. Thus (recall that $a_j \prec s_1$, whence $\phi(a_j) \prec s_2$) a pair a_j, c_j can be found such that

$$\phi(a_j) \prec s_2 \preccurlyeq c_j.$$

By proposition 4.5.10 of [4] it follows that $\phi(a_j) \prec c_j$. Hence there is a neighbourhood of c_j which lies entirely in the open — by [8, lemma 14.3] — set $I^+(\phi(a_j))$. And according to $(*)$ that neighbourhood contains points of $\phi(N_1^* \cap B_{r_j})$. So there also must exist points d_j:

$$\phi(a_j) \prec d_j, \qquad d_j \in \phi(N_1^* \cap B_{r_j}) \subset N_2^*.$$

The last inclusion coupled with the fact that N_2^* is a past set means that the timelike curve λ_j connecting $\phi(a_j)$ with d_j lies entirely in N_2^* and thus defines the curve $\mu_j \equiv \phi^{-1}(\lambda_j)$. The latter possesses all the desired properties: it is timelike, it starts in a_j, and it ends in B_{r_j}.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by RFBR Grant No. 15-02-06818.

---

[1] V. A. Ugarov *Special Theory of Relativity* (Moscow: Mir Publishers, 1979).

[2] Y. Bruhat *The Cauchy Problem* in Gravitation: an introduction to current research, Ed. L. Witten (New York: Wiley, 1962).

[3] S. V. Krasnikov *Gravitation and Cosmology* **17** (2011) 194.

[4] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis *The Large scale structure of spacetime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

[5] R. J. Low *Class. Quantum Grav.* **16** (1999) 543.

[6] M. A. G. Bonilla and J. M. M. Senovilla *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78** (1997) 793.

[7] R. M. Wald *General relativity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

[8] B. O'Neill *Semi-Riemannian geometry* (New York: Academic Press, 1983).